APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/943,356	10/01/97	CHARI S	MNFRAME.033A

LM02/0519

KNOBBE MARTENS
OLSON & BEAR
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTEENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660-8016

EXAMINER
NAJJAR, S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2758	

DATE MAILED:
05/19/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Oct 1, 1997* _____ .

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ____*3*____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-31* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-31* _____ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

        ☐ received.

        ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

        ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *Certified copies not received: _____ .

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). *3 and 7*

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- *SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES* ---

1.   This action is responsive to the application filed on October 1, 1997. Claims 1-31 are

pending examination. Claims 1-31 represent an apparatus directed toward managing computer

system alerts.

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims
under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was
commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to
the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor
and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was
made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35
U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell et

al., U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081.

Bonnell teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system for monitoring

and managing computer resources and applications across a distributed computing environment

using an intelligent autonomous agent architecture.

As per claim 1, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of receiving a plurality of alerts, said

alerts providing status information about different components in a computer using manager

software system 34 of network management computer system 10 (see fig. 11; col. 9)

Bonnell further teaches selectively disabling the display of one or more of said alerts, and

recording said status information associated with said disabled alerts in a storage medium using

event manager 210 and event log 206 (see fig. 12; col. 9).

Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of an alert. However, Bonnell discloses an

event manager that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the

computer network including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution (see col. 2-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Bonnell by specifying alerts in place of events as taught by Bonnell since the

same functionality is achieved.

As per claims 2-3, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation storing whether each of said

alerts is disabled or enabled in a plurality of variables; and storing information about said enabled

and disabled alerts in said storage medium using event filter and system agent (see figs. 17-18;

col. 12, lines 5-30, col. 13-14).

As per claims 4-5, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of recording a recommended

course of action associated with one of said alerts; and generating a user interface which

directs the selection of said alerts by providing a description of said alerts using graphical interface

module (see col. 4).

As per claims 6-10, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation wherein said user interface

enables said selected alerts in response to an enable command, or disable said selected alerts in

response to a disable command, wherein said alerts are displayed in an alert notification window

that is configured to display the name of said component associated with one of said alerts;

wherein said alert notification window is configured to display the recommended course of action

associated with one of said alerts using graphical user interface 50, interface 54, event manager

52, database 47, and 49 (see fig. 2; col. 2-3).

As to claims 11-12, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of generating a notification

regarding the status of at least one of said components in a computer, said notification

comprising a first code which contains data about said component, said first code having a first

data length using Agent software system 36, and event messages sent by agent software system

36 (see fig. 3; col. 2-4).

Bonnell further teaches receiving said notification at a remote computer, and transforming

said notification into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein

said second data length is significantly greater than said first data length using Manager software

system 34 (see fig. 2; col. 2-4).

Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of a notification. However, Bonnell

discloses an event manager that is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences

throughout the computer network including occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution

(see col. 2-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying notifications in place of reporting of events as

taught by Bonnell since the same functionality is achieved.

As per claim 13, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation wherein the act of sending

performs simple network management protocol SNMP transactions (see col. 14-15).

As to claims 14-17, the rejection of claims 1-13 is fully applied herein. Further, Bonnell

does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein said first code contains an index; wherein

said status module uses said index to identify said user-friendly display message; wherein said

index is predefined by a management information base; wherein said management information

associates information about said component with said index; wherein said status module uses

said information about said component from said management information base to generate said

user- friendly display message. However, Bonnell discloses a knowledge module parser 44 that is

responsible for accessing knowledge module 38 and parsing the information therein for use by

knowledge database manager 46, which in turn creates and maintains database 47 of knowledge

that is more readily useable by manager software 34, and event manager 52 that is responsible for

keeping records of alarms in the network and their resolution, and hence perform the same

functionality of the index (see fig. 2; col. 2).

The use of an index that points to a base of information is well known in the data

processing art and therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to modify Bonnell by specifying a index in the event reported to the

management console.

11-12, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of storing information about said enabled and disabled alerts; and wherein said log module stores a name of said component associated with one of said alerts using Knowledge manager database , and event filter (see fig. 4; col. 12).

As per claims 18-19, Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation of displaying a description of said notification and the recommended course of action associated with one of said alerts using graphical user interface 50, interface 54, event manager 52, database 47, and 49 (see fig. 2; col. 2-3).

Claims 20-27 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-19 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnell et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081 in view of Giorgio, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,085.

As per claims 28-31 the rejection of claims 1-27 is fully applied herein. Further, Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein one of said alerts relates to the status of a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit. However, Giorgio teaches a method for monitoring various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit for equipment at network sites (see figs. 1-2; col. 4-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell in view of Giorgio so that various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit are monitored. One would be motivated to do so to optimize the working parameters of a network node.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Johnson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,689,637 teaches a console simulator, multi-console management system and console management distribution system. Komori et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,487,148 teaches a method and apparatus for detecting faults in a computer network. Dev et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,812,750 teaches a method and apparatus for monitoring status of nonpollable devices in a network. Jancke et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,764,913 teaches a computer network status

monitoring system.

6.   a shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Saleh Najjar
Examiner Art Unit 2758

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER